

No. 4:10-CR-88-D
No. 4:12-CV-201-D

Respondent.

Case 4:10-cr-00088-D Document 92 Filed 04/07/14 Page 1 of 2

district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” Id. (quotation omitted).

The court has reviewed the M&R, the record, and Williams’s objections. As for those portions of the M&R to which Williams made no objection, the court is satisfied that there is no clear error on the face of the record. The court has reviewed de novo the portions of the M&R to which Williams objected and has reviewed the record.

Williams objects to Judge Gates’s finding that Williams never instructed his counsel to file a notice of appeal. See [D.E. 89] 2–7; cf. M&R 6–12. Williams also objects to Judge Gates’s conclusion that Williams’s counsel acted consistently with the Sixth Amendment in representing Williams. See [D.E. 89] 2–7; cf. M&R 6–12.

The court agrees with Judge Gates’s finding and conclusions. Williams never instructed his counsel to file a notice of appeal, and Williams’s counsel acted consistently with the Sixth Amendment in representing Williams.

In sum, the court ADOPTS the findings and conclusions in the M&R [D.E. 87] and DENIES Williams’s motion to vacate, set aside, or correct his sentence [D.E. 45]. The court DENIES a certificate of appealability. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c). The clerk shall close the case.

SO ORDERED. This 7 day of April 2014.


JAMES C. DEVER III
Chief United States District Judge